



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,897	04/08/2004	Maxim A. Ivanov	MSFT121931	8868
26389 7590 02/19/2008 CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC 1420 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 2800 SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347			EXAMINER KIM, PAUL	
			ART UNIT 2161	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/19/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

mn

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/820,897

Applicant(s)

IVANOV, MAXIM A.

Examiner

PAUL KIM

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment filed on 3 January 2008.
2. Claims 1-16 are pending and present for examination. Claims 1 and 9 are in independent form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. **Claims 9-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. It is noted that the limitations of the claims may be considered to be software, per se, since the claims fail to recite the integration of any hardware components. Furthermore, wherein the "communication channel" is a software entity which works with the XML parsing agent, said limitation may be considered to be software, per se.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1, 6-10, and 14-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golden (U.S. Patent No. 6,925,631), filed on 8 December 2000, and issued on 2 August 2005.
7. **As per independent claim 1**, Golden discloses:

A method for facilitating parsing XML data, the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2161

creating a user-defined parsing function {See Golden, C4:L6-17, wherein this reads over "the invocation of software components mapped to the tags is performed during the parsing process"};

mapping an XML element to the user-defined parsing function {See Golden, C4:L26-38, wherein this reads over "[f]or tags which are mapped, in the disclosed embodiments, the mapping is a single-valued function"};

exposing the mapping to an agent via a communication channel {See Golden, C5:L2-10, wherein this reads over "the discrete software components comprises a method, which is invoked as the start-tag of a tag, is parsed (called 'init method') and a further method, which is invoked as the end-tag of a tag, is parsed"};

receiving an event for the element from an event-based reader of XML data containing the element {See Golden, C4:L10-16, wherein this reads over "[t]he preferred parser (an event-driven Application Programming Interface (API) is the 'simple API for XML' (SAX) parser"; and C5:L11-22, wherein this reads over "the 'behavior' that is induced by a certain tag is not fixed, but can be changed depending on the context in which the input stream is parsed, or any other internal or external conditions"};

pre-parsing the content of the element using a state machine automatically generated by the agent in accordance with the exposed mapping {See Golden, C4:L35-38, wherein this reads over "there is a one-ton-one mapping between all mapped tags and software components." In other words, to each mapped tag corresponds exactly one software component"}; and

sending the pre-parsed content of the element via the communication channel to the user-defined parsing function {See Golden, C5:L44-62, wherein this reads over "[a]s a tag of the input stream is parsed, the software component mapped to it is invoked" and "[a]nother possible source for XML input is a database, since data can advantageously be stored in databases in the form of XML documents or document fragments. Such an XML database output forms an input for the disclosed embodiments, and as a tag is parse, a software components mapped to it is invoked"}.

8. As per dependent claim 6, Golden discloses:

The method of claim 1, wherein the event-based reader of XML data is a SAX reader, and receiving the event for the mapped XML element includes selecting from a plurality of events that have been pushed by the SAX reader only those events that are associated with the mapped XML element {See Golden, C8:L56-C9:L61, wherein this reads over "[t]he SAX parser, an event-driven API, is used for the parsing process. The application registers an event handler to a parser object that implements the org.sax.Parser interface. The event handler interface DocumentHandler is called whenever an element is found in the input stream"}.

9. As per dependent claim 7, Golden discloses:

The method of claim 1, wherein pre-parsing the content of the XML element includes at least one of verifying a structure of the XML element relative to other XML elements occurring in the XML data, verifying a consistency of the XML element, extracting an attribute of the XML element, and collecting a content of the XML element {See Golden, C5:L44-62, wherein this reads over "[a]s a tag of the input stream is parsed, the software component mapped to it is invoked, for example, a software component for accessing a database. Information retrieved from the database may then be built into a document page"; and "as a tag is parse, a software component mapped to it is invoked"}.

Art Unit: 2161

10. As per dependent claim 8, Golden discloses:

The method of claim 1, further comprising:

mapping an XML element that was previously mapped to an existing parsing function {See Golden, C4:L26-38, wherein this reads over "[f]or tags which are mapped, in the disclosed embodiments, the mapping is a single-valued function"};

joining the existing parsing function to the created parsing function {See Golden, C6:L51-67};

sending the pre-parsed content of the mapped XML element via the communication channel to the joined parsing functions {See Golden, C5:L44-62, wherein this reads over "[a]s a tag of the input stream is parsed, the software component mapped to it is invoked" and "[a]nother possible source for XML input is a database, since data can advantageously be stored in databases in the form of XML documents or document fragments. Such an XML database output forms an input for the disclosed embodiments, and as a tag is parse, a software components mapped to it is invoked"}.

11. As per independent claim 9, Golden discloses:

A system for parsing XML data, the system comprising:

a library of custom parsing functions to parse content of XML elements {See Golden, C16:L25-67, wherein this reads over "[t]he XBF engine 13 processes the XML input document 14 as described in the context of FIGS. 5 and 6, using bindings 12 which define the mapping between the tags in the XML input document 14 and classes"};

a parser having a map that associates custom parsing functions with XML elements {See Golden, C4:L6-17, wherein this reads over "the invocation of software components mapped to the tags is performed during the parsing process"};

a communication channel;

an agent that obtains the content of an XML element on behalf of the parser in accordance with the map {See Golden, C5:L2-10, wherein this reads over "the discrete software components comprises a method, which is invoked as the start-tag of a tag, is parsed (called 'init method') and a further method, which is invoked as the end-tag of a tag, is parsed"}, wherein the map is accessed via the communication channel, and further where the agent passes the content to the associated custom parsing function via the communication channel {See Golden, C5:L44-62, wherein this reads over "[a]s a tag of the input stream is parsed, the software component mapped to it is invoked" and "[a]nother possible source for XML input is a database, since data can advantageously be stored in databases in the form of XML documents or document fragments. Such an XML database output forms an input for the disclosed embodiments, and as a tag is parse, a software components mapped to it is invoked"}.

12. As per dependent claim 10, Golden discloses:

The system of claim 9, wherein the library of custom parsing functions is a class library of members that receive content from the agent via the communication channel {See Golden, C4:L39-43, wherein this reads over "the discrete software components are classes of an object-oriented programming language, like Java" and "[t]hey can likewise be procedures or functions of a procedural programming language"}.

Art Unit: 2161

13. As per dependent claim 14, Golden discloses:

The system of claim 9, further comprising an event-based reader, wherein the agent obtains the content of the XML element on behalf of the parser, including handling events generated for the XML element by the event-based reader {See Golden, C5:L2-10, wherein this reads over "the discrete software components comprises a method, which is invoked as the start-tag of a tag, is parsed (called 'init method') and a further method, which is invoked as the end-tag of a tag, is parsed"}.

14. As per dependent claim 15, Golden discloses:

The system of claim 14, wherein the event-based reader of XML data is a SAX reader {See Golden, C4:L10-16, wherein this reads over "[t]he preferred parser (an event-driven Application Programming Interface (API) is the 'simple API for XML' (SAX) parser"; and C5:L11-22, wherein this reads over "the 'behavior' that is induced by a certain tag is not fixed, but can be changed depending on the context in which the input stream is parsed, or any other internal or external conditions"}, and handling events generated for the XML element includes at least one of verifying a structure of the XML element relative to other XML elements occurring in the XML data, verifying a consistency of the XML element, extracting an attribute of the XML element, and collecting the content of the XML element {See Golden, C5:L44-62, wherein this reads over "[a]s a tag of the input stream is parsed, the software component mapped to it is invoked, for example, a software component for accessing a database. Information retrieved from the database may then be built into a document page"; and "as a tag is parse, a software component mapped to it is invoked"}.

15. As per dependent claim 16, Golden discloses:

The system of claim 9, wherein the agent obtains the content of the XML element on behalf of the parser using a state machine generated in accordance with the map {See Golden, C4:L35-38, wherein this reads over "there is a one-ton-one mapping between all mapped tags and software components. In other words, to each mapped tag corresponds exactly one software component"}.

16. Claims 2-5 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golden, as applied to claims 1, 6-7, 9-10, and 14-16 above, and further in view of Vosburgh (U.S. Patent No. 7,089,533), filed on 1 August 2001, published on 14 October 2004, and issued on 8 August 2006.

17. As per dependent claim 2, Golden, in combination with Vosburgh, discloses:

The method of claim 1, wherein the parsing function is a member of a user class library {See Golden, C4:L39-43, wherein this reads over "the discrete software components are classes of an object-oriented programming language, like Java" and "[t]hey can likewise be procedures or functions of a procedural programming language"}, and mapping the XML element to the parsing function includes creating a parsing map describing the XML element and identifying the class member associated with the XML element {See Vosburgh, C4:L44-60, wherein this reads over "[t]he XML session manager 102 maps XML files to an object model 110 of the application 111 and vice versa using mapping meta-data that defines how XML files map to the object model"; and C5:L11-23, wherein this reads over "the mapping meta-data may defined the referenced class and the XML elements used to define the relationship"}.

Art Unit: 2161

While Greenfield may fail to expressly disclose the identification of a class member associated with the XML element, Vosburgh discloses an XML session manager that maps XML elements to a referenced class. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above invention suggested by Golden with the invention as disclosed by Vosburgh.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this modification so that the class member may be used in executing the parser functions which parse the content of the XML element.

18. As per dependent claim 3, Golden, in combination with Vosburgh, discloses:

The method of claim 2, wherein sending the pre-parsed content of the mapped XML element via the communication channel to the parsing function includes looking up the class member identified as being associated with the XML element {See Vosburgh, C5:L11-23, wherein this reads over "the mapping meta-data may defined the referenced class and the XML elements used to define the relationship"}, and sending the pre-parsed content of the XML element to the associated class member {See Vosburgh, C7:L18-36}.

While Greenfield may fail to expressly disclose the identification of a class member associated with the XML element, Vosburgh discloses an XML session manager that maps XML elements to a referenced class. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above invention suggested by Golden with the invention as disclosed by Vosburgh.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this modification so that the class member may be used in executing the parser functions which parse the content of the XML element.

19. As per dependent claim 4, Golden, in combination with Vosburgh, discloses:

The method of claim 2, wherein the parsing function is a reusable object to which the XML element has been previously mapped, and mapping the XML element to the parsing function includes:

creating the parsing map describing the XML element and identifying the reusable object associated with the XML element {See Vosburgh, C5:L11-23, wherein this reads over "the mapping meta-data may define the referenced class and the XML elements used to define the relationship"}; and

joining the reusable object to the other parsing functions described in the parsing map {See Vosburgh, C5:L11-23, wherein this reads over "[f]or one-to-one and one-to-many relationships, meta-data indicates which elements in this (source) class's XML document are used to construct a 'key' to the other (target) class's XML document"}.

20. As per dependent claims 5 and 13, Golden, in combination with Vosburgh, discloses:

The method of claim 1, wherein the agent is an implementation class member and the communication channel is an interface to the implementation class member that enables the mapping to be exposed to the agent automatically {See Vosburgh, C6:L13-15, wherein this reads over "[t]he runtime API 103 is an interface to link the client application 111 and the XML session manager 102. The runtime API 103 defines the XML session object"}.

While Greenfield may fail to expressly disclose the identification of a class member associated with the XML element, Vosburgh discloses an XML session manager (i.e. an interface to the implementation class member) that maps XML elements to a referenced class. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above invention suggested by Golden with the invention as disclosed by Vosburgh. Additionally, it is noted that the present claim recites the intended use of "enabl[ing] the mapping to be exposed to the agent automatically" such that the aforementioned limitation is not afforded patentable weight.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this modification so that the class member may be used in executing the parser functions which parse the content of the XML element.

21. As per dependent claim 11, Golden, in combination with Vosburgh, discloses:

The system of claim 10, wherein the map associates custom parsing functions with XML elements by associating a member name to an XML element name {See Vosburgh, C5:L11-23}.

22. As per dependent claim 12, Golden, in combination with Vosburgh, discloses:

The system of claim 9, wherein at least one of the parsing functions is a reusable object to which an XML element has been previously associated {See Vosburgh, C5:L11-23, wherein this reads over "the mapping meta-data may define the referenced class, and the XML elements used to define the relationship"}, and the parser joins the reusable object to the other parsing functions in the map {See Golden, C6:L51-67}.

While Greenfield may fail to expressly disclose that parsing function is a reusable object to which an XML element has been previously associated, Vosburgh discloses that there may be a plurality of XML

Art Unit: 2161

elements which may be mapped to the same object. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above invention suggested by Golden with the invention as disclosed by Vosburgh.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this modification so that the multiple objects would not have be created wherein one reusable shared object would suffice in providing for the parsing functions.

Response to Arguments

23. Applicant's arguments filed 3 January 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Applicant asserts the argument that Golden fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the creation of "a user-defined function." See Amendment, page 11. The Examiner respectfully disagrees in that Golden discloses that the discrete software components used in the parsing process may be part of a computer program product which includes program code for execution on a computer system. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have readily understood that said software component would have been programmed by a user such that the resulting parsing processing would be "a user-defined function."

Secondly, Applicant asserts the argument that Golden fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the "exposing the mapping to an agent via a communication channel." See Amendment, page 12. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is noted that Golden discloses that "[i]n a first application, the computer system is a server in a network, and the extensible markup language input stream is processed by the server." See Golden, col. 5, lines 46-48. Accordingly, Golden does indeed disclose a system wherein the mapping may be exposed to an agent via a communication channel (i.e. the network).

Thirdly, Applicant asserts the argument that Golden fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the "pre-parsing the content of the element using a state machine automatically generated by the agent in accordance with the exposed mapping." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is noted that Golden discloses a method wherein two or more XBF engines can work in series such that "[o]ne XBF engine generates an extensible markup language output stream which is used as an input stream for another XBF engine." See Golden, col. 5, lines 24-43. Accordingly, wherein the generation of the output stream is the result of invoking one or more of the software components, said method would read upon the present claim limitation as recited.

Accordingly, for the reasons above, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 are sustained.

Conclusion

24. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAUL KIM whose telephone number is (571)272-2737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on (571) 272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2161

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Paul Kim
Examiner
Art Unit 2161


APU MOFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER